sarcophagi is 485 (22). Some of the undecorated ones are dated well beyond 200 B.C.E., providing evidence for the continuation of the inhumation ritual in some areas until the end of Etruscan civilization.

Nancy T. de Grummond

department of classics
florida state university
tallahassee, florida 32306-1510
ndegrumm@mailer.fsu.edu

Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius, by *Paul Rehak*, edited by *John G. Younger*. Pp. xxiv + 222, figs. 46. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison 2006. $60. ISBN 0-299-22010-9 (cloth).

Paul Rehak's book is a useful and thought-provoking contribution to the study of a quintessential Augustan place. Even while some imperfections remain due to the author's untimely death before he could complete the work, we can be grateful to John Younger for taking on that task and presenting us with Rehak's vision of the architectural program of the northern Campus Martius. One of the chief virtues of the book is that it looks at the buildings as an ensemble, which clearly was the builders' intention.

Rehak's main interpretive take, summarized succinctly in his short first chapter and the conclusion, is that this complex and its individual components project Augustus not as the first citizen harking back to the republic but as "unabashedly monarchical" (8). They thus "convey specific monarchic messages that are at variance with the emphasis of literary sources of the time and recent modern scholarship" (145). In this area of Rome, where Augustus could build freely without the impediments of earlier structures, there was no need for cautious adaptation and incremental modifications. The site, therefore, provided Augustus with the opportunity for a different kind of self-representation.

The exact mix, of course, of monarchic and republican elements in all areas of Augustan government and culture is an ongoing and longstanding subject of debate (see W. Eder, *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus* [Cambridge 2005] 13–32). It was a constantly varying mix, too, with all kinds of nuances that would elicit different responses from different viewers, as would the Theater of Pompey, to name only one republican example (discussed by Rehak in the course of his survey, which constitutes ch. 2, of the development of the entire Campus Martius). Rehak, therefore, seems to be more on target by stating that "the monuments, individually and collectively, thus became subjects for reflection and discussion . . . a means for evaluating and assessing Augustus and his achievements" (8). The same is true of much of Augustan poetry and art.

We can usefully pursue this perspective throughout the three central chapters where the author discusses the relevant buildings at length, starting with the Mausoleum. It is, of course, a typically Augustan example of the power of evoking and suggesting several traditions even while the final product, and many details of construction, are unique. Rehak offers an excellent survey, which is balanced, comprehensive, and concise. It includes the usual antecedents, such as Hellenistic ruler tombs, Etruscan tumuli, tombs of Roman nobles, and even a reference to the much more humble heroon of Aeneas at Lavinium, among others. Rehak also usefully looks at construction techniques, especially for the extensive substructures, and rightly places them in the context of Italian rather than Egyptian precedents. The connection with Egypt he pursues is different: the Mausoleum as an equivalent to Alexander's tomb in Alexandria and a response to Antony's alleged plan to relocate the *caput mundi* to Cleopatra's capital. Both these suggestions (for the latter, of course, Rehak gives due credit to earlier scholars) can be placed in even larger contexts. One is that Egyptianizing was a matter not only of aesthetics but also of appropriation, an Augustan characteristic that was operative throughout the entire political and cultural spectrum. Topographically, the material (including obelisks) and conceptual Egyptian elements of the Mausoleum establish a connection with the many Alexandrian elements of the southern Campus Martius, most notably the Iseum. Rehak posits too much of a divide between the northern and southern parts of the Campus, and for that reason, for example, chooses not to follow up on any associations between the northern buildings and the Pantheon.

What comes to the fore at an early stage is Octavian/Augustus' self-representation as master of the Alexandrian *oikoumene* of the Roman nation. The Mausoleum's synthesis of architectural and cultural traditions converges with its monumental representation, which is stressed well by Rehak, of the Roman successor of Alexander; at the same time, the Alexander *imitatio* links Octavian/Augustus with leading figures of the republic. And is there a contradiction between that and the *Res Gestae* inscription that was displayed in front? Absolutely not: while it insists that Augustus' mode of government (at home) is guided by *auctoritas*, rather than *potestas*, he also unabashedly projects himself as a world conqueror and master builder; the *Res Gestae* is the epigraphical companion to the Mausoleum's grandeur.

Similar perspectives apply to the Horologium-Solarium, which Rehak discusses in chapter 4. He sets it well against the background of timekeeping and the management of the calendar in Rome and also connects it with Augustus' association with Apollo/Helios/Sol. In terms of its actual workings, Rehak closely hews to the line advanced by Buchner, including the hypothesis that the obelisk gnomon pointed directly at the Ara Pacis on 23 September, Augustus' birthday. While being cognizant of the multiple meanings of the monument, Rehak views it primarily as "a symbol of the restoration of cosmic order, paralleling Augustus' political 'restoration' of the Republic" (95).

As always, this is a springboard for further considerations that enlarge the framework. Caesar's calendar reform signaled that time, and the calendar, like other key political and cultural spheres, ceased being the prerogative of the Roman aristocracy. Wallace-Hadrill's pithy summary, that "Roman time becomes the property of all Romans" (*The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus* [Cambridge 2005] 61) can be put side by side with Rehak's observation that large sundials served the purpose of making them "more accessible to groups of people" (67). The Horologium, then, and its immense scale are but the physical manifestation of time belonging to all Romans. Further, the true parallel for the cosmic order that

the monument symbolizes is not just Rome or Italy but the Mediterranean *oikoumene*. That, in turn, establishes a link to another strong dimension of the Horologium, which is underemphasized by Rehak—world domination.

Besides the Mausoleum, several of these thematics also link the Horologium to the Ara Pacis, the subject of chapter 5. Here, Rehak takes the opportunity to reprise his reinterpretation of Aeneas as Numa ("Aeneas or Numa? Rethinking the Meaning of the Ara Pacis Augustae," *ArtB* 83 [2001] 190–208) within a more extensive discussion of the entire monument. This leads to many stimulating observations; a good example is Rehak's argument that Mars is best understood as the eponymous divinity of the Campus. Augustus' succinct formulation that "*pax* was brought forth by victories" (*Res Gestae* 13) is relevant here and would give us another connection with the Mausoleum and Horologium. As for Numa, the multiple meanings of both the Ara Pacis itself (and its companions in the Campus) and its sculptural program do not exclude such an interpretation; nor, however, should it be exclusionary. For various reasons, including the dynastic link to Augustus, I still consider Aeneas as the primary figure. On another much-debated topic, the nationality of some of the children, Rehak comes down on the side of those who see them as foreigners. An additional reason for this identification is that it integrates the Ara Pacis yet more fully into the ecumenical and imperial context of the other two monuments.

As can be seen, Rehak's book, like the monuments themselves, richly asks for reflection, dialogue, and response. It will remain essential for the scholarly discussion of these unique witnesses to the Augustan era for a long time.

KARL GALINSKY

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS C3400
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712-0308
GALINSKY@MAIL.UTEXAS.EDU

LES GUERRES DACIQUES DE DOMITIEN ET DE TRAJAN: ARCHITECTURE MILITAIRE, TOPOGRAPHIE, IMAGES ET HISTOIRE, by *Alexandre Simon Stefan* (Collection de l'École Française de Rome 353). Pp. xiii + 811, figs. 286. École Française de Rome, Rome 2005. €160. ISBN 2-7283-0638-9 (paper).

"To study one discipline to the exclusion of the others, on the grounds that archaeology or history or literature or art has its own theoretical framework makes no sense. . . . Our subjects . . . are what gives us our tasks" (M. Carver, "Marriages of True Minds: Archaeology with Texts," in B. Cunliffe, W. Davies, and C. Renfrew, eds., *Archaeology: The Widening Debate* [Oxford 2002] 489).

Unlike many scholars before him, Alexandre Simon Stefan has independently developed a similarly comprehensive approach (cf. 5, 695, 699) to the one Carver rightly advocates. This is not just another study of the art of the Column of Trajan, neither is it another text-based account on the Dacian Wars; it is an in-depth study that seeks to take all available evidence into account, commendably also the much-neglected and little-known archaeological remains of Dacian fortifications and Roman military installations of the period. The methodological breadth, ranging from detailed topographical surveys of key sites in Dacia (powerfully supported by aerial photographs and detailed plans) to an art historical evaluation of the monuments in the empire's capital and imperial and provincial coinage celebrating Domitian's and Trajan's Dacian victories, is impressive. Stefan is remarkably persuasive in bringing separate strands of evidence together in his multidisciplinary jigsaw. He is, for example, not the first to suggest that the mountain crests at the site of a camp or fort under construction, depicted on scene LXV of Trajan's column, could refer to an installation on a major mountainous ridge (587–92, fig. 242). Yet the argument, disputed by Lepper and Frere (*Trajan's Column* [Gloucester 1988, 105]), is made much more persuasive through his survey of Roman marching camps on mountain summits and crests, some of them at almost 2,000 masl in the heartland of Dacia (287–321, 572–83).

The holding capacity of the known marching camps (582–84; cf. J.L. Davies and R.H. Jones, *Roman Camps in Wales and the Marches* [Cardiff 2006, 39–45]) accounts only for a small fraction of the estimated 100,000–200,000 soldiers involved in the Trajanic Wars (526–27). They provide invaluable insights into troop movements, even if we see barely more than the proverbial tip of the iceberg.

Chronologically, Stefan places the main emphasis on the Dacian Wars of Domitian and Trajan (as the title promises). But the evolution of Dacian defensive architecture, which (as the author persuasively argues [267–72, 696]) owes much to Hellenistic prototypes, is examined over several centuries leading up to the loss of Dacian independence. The reign of Trajan marks the end of the period under examination. Thematically, the emphasis is on military history, the material remains of the monuments that played a part in the conflicts, and the works of art that shed light on their history. Aspects of Dacian culture unrelated to warfare are not central to this study, even if the thorough survey of Dacian fortifications, including their associated buildings, also provides fascinating glimpses on nonmilitary facets of this advanced and, in some respects, unique civilization. Stefan is able to show that the number of posts in the round "sanctuaries" is unlikely to be based on a hypothetical Dacian calendar, as widely argued (e.g., H. Daicoviciu, *Die Daker* [Mainz 1980] 64). The posts (more of which are known now than when the theory was first advanced) formed the invisible inner parts of walls (43–69). The significance of architectural similarities between some of the monumental round and rectangular structures, thought to be sanctuaries, and possibly secular round houses and granaries, may have been worth exploring (cf. K. Lockyear, "The Late Iron Age Background to Roman Dacia," in W.S. Hanson and I.P. Haynes, eds., *Roman Dacia* [Portsmouth 2004] 55–63).

Perhaps the most impressive aspect of Stefan's study is his ability to show the remarkable sophistication of the Dacian military infrastructure. The natural defenses of prominent mountain summits, often towering several hundred meters over the surrounding landscape, were masterfully enhanced by solid walls around the contours, earthworks, and towers. The efforts of generations eventually resulted in a significant number of almost impregnable bulwarks, frequently including cisterns or springs within the defended perimeter to ensure perennial water supply. Artillery was in the Dacian arsenal, and they also mastered the construction of mine-